MYCOTAXON

Volume 110, pp. 493–504 *October–December 2009*

Fungal nomenclature. Proposals to conserve or reject

Abstract — Formal proposals to conserve or protect fungal names are published concurrently in Mycotaxon and Taxon. Authors of Prop. 1861 (to conserve the name *Aspicilia farinosa* with a conserved type) amend their proposal to reflect an earlier combination date. Complete proposals include Prop. 1896 (to conserve the name *Lichen lichenoides* against *L. tremelloides* and *L. tremella*), Prop. 1897 (to reject the name *Lecidea epiploica*), Prop. 1898 (to conserve *Stirtonia* A.L. Sm. against *Stirtonia* R. Br. bis), and Prop. 1899 (to conserve the name *Hebeloma cylindrosporum* against *H. angustispermum*).

Proposal 1861 to conserve *Aspicilia farinosa:* author correction*

Anders Nordin[1] & Claude Roux[2]

anders.nordin@evolmuseum.uu.se
[1]Museum of Evolution, Uppsala University
Norbyv. 16, SE-752 36 Uppsala, Sweden

claude.roux21@wanadoo.fr
[2]Institut méditerranéen d'Écologie et de paléoécologie
FR-13397 Marseille, France

After the publication of our proposal (Nordin & Roux 2009. Proposal to conserve the name the name *Aspicilia farinosa* (*Ascomycota: Pertusariales: Megasporaceae*) with a conserved type. Taxon 58: 292), Bernard Abbott correctly pointed out to us that *Aspicilia farinosa* had been combined into *Aspicilia* at an earlier date than generally assumed (by us, Zahlbruckner, and Hue as well as in Index Fungorum), namely in Flagey 1888: 131 (Flagey, C. 1888: Herborisation lichénologique dans les environs de Constantine (Algérie). Revue Mycologique 10: 126-134.) This does not affect the conservation proposal other than that the author citation ought to be changed to *Aspicilia farinosa* (Flörke) Flagey instead of *Aspicilia farinosa* (Flörke) Hue.

*This correction will not appear in Taxon but form a part of the on-going deliberations by the Nomenclature Committee for *Fungi*.

Proposal 1896: to conserve the name *Lichen lichenoides* (*Leptogium lichenoides*) against *Lichen tremelloides* and *L. tremella* (lichenized *Ascomycota*)

[As published in Taxon* 58: 1002–1003]

Per M. Jørgensen

gerd.jorgensen@tele2.no
Department of Natural History, Bergen Museum, University of Bergen
Allégt. 41, N-5007 Bergen, Norway

(1896) ***Lichen lichenoides*** Wulfen in Jacquin, Collectanea 3: 136. 1791 (sero), **nom. cons. prop.** Typus: Sweden, Herb. Linnaeus No. 1276.9 (lower specimen) (LINN), **typ. cons. prop.**

(=) *Lichen tremelloides* Weiss, Pl. Crypt. Fl. Gott.: 52. 1770, nom. rej. prop. **Lectotypus** (**hic designatus**): [icon in] Dillenius, Hist. Musc.: t. 19, f. 31. 1742. **Epitypus** (**hic designatus**): Herb. Dillenius No. 19.31A, (OXF).

(=) *Lichen tremella* Roth, Tent. Fl. Germ. 1: 503. Feb– Apr 1788, nom. rej. prop. **Neotypus** (**hic designatus**): Sweden, Herb. Linnaeus No. 1276.9 (lower specimen) (LINN).

In a recent paper dealing with the typification of Linnaean algal names (Spencer & al. in Taxon 58: 237–260. 2009) it was noted that "*Tremella* L." as typified by Donk (in Taxon 7: 236–250. 1958) applies to a genus of heterocystous *Nostocaceae* with a starting-point date of 1892 under Art. 13.1 (e) of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006). Thus "*Tremella lichenoides* L.", long considered as the basionym of a widespread and well-known *Leptogium* species, is not validly published.[1] Spencer & al. suggested that the correct name for this species should be *Leptogium lichenoides* (Wulfen) Zahlbr. This is, however, a more complicated case in need of further study and action.

According to Zahlbruckner (Cat. Lich. Univ. 3: 136. 1924) there are two older names applicable to this species, neither of which have been considered legitimate previously:

(1) *Lichen tremelloides* Weiss (l.c.) which hitherto has been regarded as illegitimate since Weiss cited the older "*Tremella lichenoides* L.", but

*Printed with permission from Taxon, the International Journal of Taxonomy, Phylogeny and Evolution and previously reviewed by Taxon Nomenclature Editors John McNeill and Scott A. Redhead.

[1] Nomenclature Editor's footnote: It can, however, be argued that as *T. nostoc* must be typified by a blue-green algal element, it was not validly published in 1753 and so is not a "simultaneously published species name" (Art. 10.2), being pre-starting date for *Nostocaceae Heterocysteae,* and so is ineligible for selection as type of *Tremella*. This would appear contrary to the intent of Art. 13.2, which originated in the Seattle Code (Stafleu & al. in Regnum Veg. 82. 1972).

because our understanding of its status has changed, Weiss's name now is the eldest legitimate one for the species. Since Weiss's herbarium appears to have been lost, it is necessary to designate one of the cited illustrations as lectotype, the best choice being that of Dillenius of which the original specimen is known, one which I have once studied (Jørgensen & James in Lichenologist 15: 113. 1983) and which is a suitable epitype.

(2) *Lichen Tremella* Roth (l.c.). Roth also cites *Tremella lichenoides* L. and he apparently wanted to transfer this to *Lichen*, but most possibly disliked the tautonymoid name that would result. He therefore coined a completely new name, using the Linnaean generic name as the epithet instead. Since Roth's main herbarium was lost during the Second World War and no other specimens have been traced, and as no illustrations are cited, it is necessary to designate a neotype. Because Roth appears to have wanted to transfer the Linnaean species into what he considered the correct genus, I find it best to designate the excellent Linnaean specimen (see further Jørgensen & al. in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 115: 261–405. 1994) as neotype.

According to this the correct name for the species would be *Leptogium tremelloides* (Weiss) Fr., unless that name or its basionym is rejected in favour of Wulfen's name.

It is, however, necessary to check on Wulfen's text in Jacquin (l.c.), the third volume of which according to Stafleu & Cowan (in Regnum Veg. 98: 412. 1979) was published late in 1791, rather than in 1789 as the title page indicates. Wulfen reports finding material of this lichen near Klagenfurt and other localities in Carinthia, and illustrates his own material, the presence of which is unknown at the moment as only a few of his cryptogamic collections appear to have survived. His illustration most probably shows the alpine form which Otalora & al. (in Taxon 57: 907–921. 2008) on the basis of molecular work claimed to be a species of its own and incorrectly named *Leptogium pulvinatum* (Hoffm.) Otalora. The type of this name is from a garden path in Cambridge, England and represents an extreme expression of *Leptogium lichenoides,* which converges towards the alpine form, such lowland forms not being included or discussed in their study.

In his discussion Wulfen makes it clear that his intention is to transfer the Linnaean epithet from the genus *Tremella*, which he obviously regarded as a non-lichenized cyanobacterial genus, to the genus *Lichen*, on the basis of the newly discovered fruiting-bodies, as well as differences in the thallus structure. In doing so he validated the Linnaean epithet, but unfortunately in an illegitimate name, as he cited *Lichen tremelloides* Weiss as a synonym. In consequence, under Art 7.5, the type of *L. lichenoides* is the type of *L. tremelloides*. Since,

however, conservation is necessary anyway, I find it best to conserve Wulfen's name with the fine Linnaean specimen as the type, for the same reason as given for *Lichen tremella*, thus preserving the intentions of Wulfen (and Roth).

It would be most unfortunate to have to change the name *Leptogium lichenoides*, the type of the generic name *Leptogium* (Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 129: 623. 1993). This name is widely and persistently used in checklists and floras in the temperate regions of both hemispheres too numerous to list here, but including Verdoon (in Fl. Austral. 54: 586. 1992) and Santesson & al. (Lichen-form. Lichenicol. Fungi Fennoscand.: 187. 2004). I accordingly propose Wulfen's name for conservation.

If the proposal is accepted, the species retains it familiar name, though with a slight change in author-citation as suggested by Spencer & al. (l.c.)

If on the other hand this proposal is not accepted, further nomenclatural actions are needed since the combination "*Leptogium tremelloides* (Weiss)" does not appear to exist, and is blocked by the homonymic *Leptogium tremelloides* S.F. Gray. This name was based on the illegitimate *Lichen tremelloides* L. fil., which is the lichen now correctly called *Leptogium cochleatum* (Dicks.) P.M. Jørg. & P. James (see further Jørgensen & James, l.c.). It would therefore be necessary to reactivate the rather unfortunate, long forgotten, *Lichen tremella* Roth, which neither has been transferred to *Leptogium*, and is better rejected to the benefit of *Leptogium lacerum* (Retz.) S.F. Gray. The proposal advanced here, is a much better alternative.

Acknowledgements

I am above all thankful to John McNeill, Edinburgh for helping me to get on the right track when trying to resolve the rather unexpected threat to the stability of this name, and for his willingness to comment on several versions of the manuscript. I am further indebted to Per Sunding, Oslo and Christian Printzen, Frankfurt who kindly assisted in locating old literature.

Proposal 1897: to reject the name *Lecidea epiploica* (lichenized *Ascomycota*)

[As published in Taxon* 58: 1003–1004]

Per M. Jørgensen[1 *] & Anders Nordin[2]

** gerd.jorgensen@tele2.no*
1 Museum of Natural History, University of Bergen
Allégt. 41, N-5007 Bergen, Norway
2 Museum of Evolution, Uppsala University
Norbyv. 16, 75236 Uppsala, Sweden

(1897) ***Lecidea epiploica*** Norman in Bot. Not. 1867: 87. 1867, **nom. rej. prop.** Holotypus: Norway, Troms, Sørreisa, Middagsfjellet, *J.M. Norman* (O)

In our study of poorly known lichen names in Scandinavia (Jørgensen & Nordin in Graphis Scripta 21: 1–20. 2009), we came across one name, *Lecidea epiploica* Norman which had not been in use since Th. Fries (Lichenogr. Scand.: 504–505. 1874), though Olivier (Bull. Géogr. Bot. 25: 93–183. 1915) included it in his European key to the lichen genus *Lecidea*, based on Fries's treatment. The type proved to be an unusual specimen of the lichen presently known as *Calvitimela perlata* (Haugan & Timdal) R. Sant. (Santesson & al., Lichen-Form. Lichenicol. Fungi Fennoscand.: 73. 2004), a younger name which has recently been clarified. We saw no reason to destabilize the situation by making a new combination before the case had been put before the nomenclature committee. This we now do.

When Th. Fries (l.c.: 534) published *Lecidea bullata* (Körber) Th. Fr. (≡ *Lecidella bullata* Körber) as a new lichen species to Scandinavia, he made an illegitimate combination, overlooking the older (from 1843) *Lecidea bullata* Meyen & Flotow which is an entirely different lichen, now regarded as a *Toninia* A. Massal. (Timdal in Opera Bot. 110: 48. 1992). Zahlbruckner (Cat. Lich. Univ. 3: 530. 1925) corrected this and introduced the new name *Lecidea bullosa* A. Zahlbr.

However, when Magnusson (in Meddel. Göteb. Bot. Trädg. 6: 94. 1931) revised the *Lecidea elata* group, he discovered that Fries had misinterpreted Körber's original description and that Fries's material from Dovre (Norway) actually was a different species in need of a new name for taxonomic reasons, and he renamed the material, *Lecidea perlata* H. Magn. Magnusson thus created another illegitimate name, overlooking the older *Lecidea perlata* Hue

*Printed with permission from Taxon, the International Journal of Taxonomy, Phylogeny and Evolution and previously reviewed by Taxon Nomenclature Editors John McNeill and Scott A. Redhead.

(from 1915), an Antarctic species now regarded as belonging in *Buellia* De Not. (Lamb in Sci. Rep. Brit. Antarc. Surv. 61: 41. 1968). When Haugan and Timdal (in Graphis Scripta 6: 17–26. 1994) revised some Arctic-alpine species in the genus *Tephromela* M. Choisy, they reclassified this species and took up Magnusson's epithet in that genus as *Tephromela perlata* Haugan & Timdal., a legitimate name. It became clear in recent years that it was better placed in the segregated genus *Calvitimela* Hafellner from 2001, so it was transferred there by Santesson & al. (l.c.) in their standard work of Scandinavian lichen nomenclature. Since it has a rather restricted distribution, the name has not been much cited since 1994, but it was used by Andreev (in Novosti Sist. Nizsh. Rast. 37: 189. 2004) so it is also in use in the other region from which it is known.

We do not think it should be necessary to introduce a new epithet now, particularly since the type specimen of *Lecidea epiploica* is not typical in that it grew at the base of a tree (instead of being saxicolous) and lacks the characteristic fatty acids of the species (Jørgensen & Nordin, l.c.). Accordingly we propose that this already forgotten name be rejected in order to maintain nomenclatural stability.

Proposal 1898: to conserve *Stirtonia* A.L. Sm. (lichenized *Ascomycota*, *Arthoniales*) against *Stirtonia* R. Br. bis (*Bryophyta*, *Dicranales*)

[As published in Taxon* 58: 1004]

Andreas Frisch* & Göran Thor

* *andreas.frisch@ekol.slu.se*
Department of Ecology, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
P.O. Box 7044, 750 07 Uppsala, Sweden

(1898) ***Stirtonia*** A.L. Sm. in Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 11: 195. 1926, **nom. cons. prop.** Typus: *Stirtonia obvallata* (Stirt.) A.L. Sm. (*Cryptothecia obvallata* Stirt.)

(=) *Stirtonia* R. Br. bis, in Trans. & Proc. New Zealand Inst. 32: 149. 1900 [*Musci*], **nom. rej. prop.** Typus: *S. mackayi* R. Br. bis

The monotypic moss genus *Stirtonia* R. Br. bis, including *S. mackayi* R. Br. bis as the only species, was made public during a reading before the Philosophical Institute of Canterbury [New Zealand] on 4 October 1899 and formally described the following year (Brown, l.c.). That author noted the close affinity of *Stirtonia* with *Trematodon* Michx. (*Dicranales*), and *S. mackayi*, the type, was transferred to *Trematodon* by V.F. Brotherus (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 1(3): 292. 1901). *Stirtonia* R. Br. bis thus became a synonym of *Trematodon*. The name *Trematodon mackayi* (R. Br. bis) Broth. has been in continuous use since then (e.g., Roth in Aussereurop. Laubmoose 1(3), Dresden: 193–272. 1911; Dixon in Bull. New Zealand Inst. 3: 31–74. 1914; Fife in Bryologist 98: 313–337. 1995), while *Stirtonia mackayi* was only mentioned in the original publication.

Stirtonia A.L. Sm. was described for a small group of tropical lichens related to, and previously placed in, *Cryptothecia* Stirt. (Smith in Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 11: 195. 1926). The two genera were referred to a separate family, *Cryptotheciaceae* A.L. Sm., based on the ascomata structure, the ascus type and the byssoid vegetative thallus. *Cryptotheciaceae* is now included in *Arthoniaceae* Rchb. (Lumbsch & Huhndorf in Myconet 13: 1–58. 2007), but this placement has been doubted (Thor in Symb. Bot. Upsal. 32(1): 267–289. 1997). Two species were included in *Stirtonia* in the original publication, namely *S. obvallata* (Stirt.) A.L. Sm. (originally published as *S. obvallata* "A.L. Sm." but authorship corrected via Art. 33.2) and *S. dubia* A.L. Sm. (Smith in Trans. Brit. Mycol.

*Printed with permission from Taxon, the International Journal of Taxonomy, Phylogeny and Evolution and previously reviewed by Taxon Nomenclature Editors John McNeill and Scott A. Redhead.

Soc. 11: 189–196. 1926). *Stirtonia obvallata* was selected as the lectotype of the generic name in a recent monographic treatment of *Stirtonia* (Makhija & Patwardhan in Mycotaxon 67: 293. 1998). Nineteen *Stirtonia* species had by then been published (Awasthi & Singh in Geophytology 1: 97–102. 1972; Makhija & Patwardhan in Biovigyanam 13(2): 43–51. 1987; Cengia Sambo in Ann. Bot. 22: 19–41. 1940; Santesson in Symb. Bot. Upsal. 12(1): 1–590. 1952; Trivelli Ricci in Atti Ist. Bot. Lab. Crittog. Univ. Pavia, ser. 5, 19: 39–45. 1962), twelve of which were accepted as good species (Makhija & Patwardhan in Mycotaxon 76: 287–311. 1998). *Stirtonia sprucei* R. Sant. has been transferred to *Amazonomyces* Bat. & Cavalc. (Lücking & al. in Lichenologist 30(2): 134. 1998) and *S. macrocephala* R. Sant. to *Eremothecella* Syd. & P. Syd. (Thor & al. in Symb. Bot. Upsal. 32(3): 39. 2000). The generic placement of the other excluded species is unclear at present. Two additional species have been published, namely *S. biseptata* Aptroot & Wolseley and *S. psoromica* Aptroot & Wolseley (Wolseley & Aptroot in Biblioth. Lichenol. 99: 411–422. 2009). The secondary chemistry of *Stirtonia ramosa* Makhija & Patw. was investigated by Culberson & al. (in Bryologist 93: 279–282. 1990). Obviously, there is no further published information on *Stirtonia* as recently defined.

Although *Stirtonia* A.L. Sm. is a small genus whose 14 species are apparently rare and only seldom collected, the name is well established among lichenologists working in tropical countries and has been in continuous scientific use to the present day. Given the fact that *Stirtonia* R. Br. bis has not been used except in the original description and is now included in *Trematodon*, it seems appropriate to conserve *Stirtonia* A.L. Sm. against it in order to ensure taxonomic stability. There is no older name available for *Stirtonia* A.L. Sm., and the introduction of a new generic name including up to 14 new combinations is unavoidable should the present proposal be rejected. The one possible detrimental result would be if *S. mackayi* were to be demonstrably phylogenetically distinct at the generic level from the type of *Trematodon*.

Stirtonia Van Wyk & Schutte (in Nord. J. Bot. 14(3): 320. 1994) (*Fabaceae*) is an illegitimate, third homonym, already replaced by *Stirtonanthus* Van Wyk & Schutte.

Proposal 1899: to conserve the name *Hebeloma cylindrosporum* against *Hebeloma angustispermum* (*Basidiomycota*)

[As published in Taxon* 58: 1005]

Jan Vesterholt[1*], Hervé Gryta[2], Roland Marmeisse[3], Henry Beker[4], Ursula Eberhardt[5], Edmondo Grilli[6] & Herbert Boyle[7]

[*] *myco@vip.cybercity.dk*
[1] *Natural History Museum of Denmark, University of Copenhagen Gothersgade 130, 1123 Copenhagen K, Denmark*
[2] *Laboratoire Evolution et Diversité Biologique, University of Toulouse Bat. 4R3 b2, 118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse Cedex 9, France*
[3] *Université de Lyon, Université Lyon 1, Ecologie Microbienne, 43 Boulevard du 11 Novembre, 69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France*
[4] *Rue Pere de Deken 19, 1040 Bruxelles, Belgium*
[5] *Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures Uppsalalaan 8, 3584 CT Utrecht, Netherlands*
[6] *Via Tiburtina Valeria 55A, 65026 Popoli, Italy*
[7] *Senckenberg Museum of Natural History Görlitz Am Museum 1, 02826 Görlitz, Germany*

(1899) ***Hebeloma cylindrosporum*** Romagn. in Bull. Soc. Mycol. France 81: 330. 1965, **nom. cons. prop.** Typus: France, Forêt d'Ermenonville (Oise), in pinetis arenosis, 27 Oct 1961, ex herb. Romagnesi (no. 61.262) (PC).

(=) *Hebeloma angustispermum* A. Pearson in Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 33: 301. 1951 ("1950"), **nom. rej. prop**. Typus: South Africa, Cape Province, Bergvliet Retreat, under *Pinus pinea*, 26 Mai 1948. *A.A. Pearson 46* (K).

Hebeloma cylindrosporum is a common agaric in pine forests all over Europe, easily distinguished from other *Hebeloma* species by the narrow, almost cylindrical spores, hence the epithet. For decades the name has been used consistently in European treatments of the genus (Bruchet in Bull. Mens. Soc. Linn. Soc. Bot. Lyon 39, Suppl. 6: 86. 1970; Vesterholt in Fungi N. Europe 3: 114–115. 2005), as well as in European fungal floras (Moser in Kl. Kryptogamenfl. II/2. 1983; Horak, Röhrlinge & Blätterpilze Europa: 377. 2005; Vesterholt in Knudsen & Vesterholt, Funga Nordica: 814. 2008). Since being described in 1951, very little attention has been drawn to the name *Hebeloma angustispermum*. Based on type studies, Grilli (in Micol. Veg. Medit.

*Printed with permission from Taxon, the International Journal of Taxonomy, Phylogeny and Evolution and previously reviewed by Taxon Nomenclature Editors John McNeill and Scott A. Redhead.

21: 3–34. 2006) was first to call attention to the synonymy of *H. cylindrosporum* with *H. angustispermum*. Sequence data derived from the holotypes (see collection data above) of *H. cylindrosporum* (ITS sequence GenBank accession no. FJ769356) and *H. angustispermum* (ITS sequence GenBank accession no. FJ769357) confirm Grilli's results.

Hebeloma cylindrosporum is a widely used name, in particular by many researchers working on mycorrhizae. The importance of the name *Hebeloma cylindrosporum* in academic research can be demonstrated by the number of citations in scientific literature using this name. A bibliographic search through the two international databases of scientific literature: ISI Web of Science (http://www.isiknowledge .com/) and Scopus (http://www.scopus.com/) has recorded the name *Hebeloma cylindrosporum* in the title of 67 scientific publications and in at least 585 different published works originating from 30 different countries. By comparison, a similar search using the name *Hebeloma angustispermum* as input failed to find any record. The species referred to as *Hebeloma cylindrosporum* is one of the six most intensively studied species of ectomycorrhizal fungi. It is used as a model because its mycelium is easy to grow *in vitro* and its entire life cycle can be completed under controlled conditions (Debaud & al. in New Phytol. 105: 429–435. 1987; Marmeisse & al. in New Phytol. 163: 481–498. 2004). This latter feature has so far not been achieved for any other ectomycorrhizal fungus. These properties of this species have allowed scientists to explore different fields of mycorrhizal research such as physiology, molecular functioning, ecology, and population genetics and to make significant advances in understanding the biology of mycorrhizal symbiosis. This research has also led to the development of important collections of fungal strains as well as of DNA sequences deposited in the EMBL/DDJB/GenBank database.

For the reasons mentioned above, we find that a name change for this well-known species would be unfortunate. Therefore, with reference to Art. 14.1–2, we propose *H. cylindrosporum* to be conserved against *H. angustispermum*. We further note that confusion with an earlier name, *Agaricus spoliatus* Fr. (Epicr. Syst. Mycol.: 182. 1838 ['1836–1838']), is not relevant. Gröger (in Z. Mykol. 53: 50. 1987) argued for the synonymization of *Hebeloma spoliatum* (Fr.) Gillet (1876) with *H. cylindrosporum* but adoption of the name *H. spoliatum* has not been generally accepted. The basionym, *Agaricus spoliatus* Fr. (l.c.) has not to our knowledge been typified. Grilli (l.c.: 14) discussed the identity of *H. spoliatum* and pointed out that *Agaricus spoliatus* Fr. was described from mountainous coniferous forests, whereas *H. cylindrosporum* is a lowland species from sandy pine forests. Primarily for this reason, we do not believe *A. spoliatus* applies to the same species as *H. cylindrosporum*, and the identity of *A. spoliatus* and its typification will be dealt with separately.

Proposals to amend the Code

(**001–002) Proposals to add two examples on the valid publication of the names of higher-level taxa

[Published concurrently in Taxon 59, 2010 (in press)]

S.A. Redhead

scott.redhead@agr.gc.ca

National Mycological Herbarium,

Eastern Cereal and Oilseed Research Centre, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada

C.E.F., Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0C6

Arising from a reference under Art. 32.4 to the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi as to whether the descriptive statements associated with *Ascomycota* and *Blastocladiomycota* by Cavalier-Smith and Doweld, respectively, satisfied the requirement of Art. 32.1(d) for a "description or diagnosis", it appeared that it would be useful to include in the Code specific examples of the application of Art. 32.4 in light of the recommendations of the Committee (Norvell in Taxon 59: in press. 2010). Accordingly I propose the following two new examples:

(001) Insert the following new example following Art. 32.4:

> *Ex. 6bis.* *Ascomycota* Caval.-Sm. (as '*Ascomycota* Berkeley 1857 stat nov.', Biol. Rev. 73: 247. 1998) was validly published as a phylum name, minimally fulfilling requirements for Art. 32.1(d) via the diagnosis "*sporae intracellulares*" that, in the opinion of the author (Art. 32.2), served to differentiate it from the only other phylum in the subkingdom in his classification. Berkeley (Intro. Crypt. Bot.: 270. 1857) had introduced the name *Ascomycetes* [not *Ascomycota*] as a replacement for '*Endotheques,* Lev.' and applied it to an ambiguously ranked taxon.

(002) Insert the following new example following that in Prop. 001:

> *Ex. 6ter.* Doweld (Prosyllabus Tracheophytorum: LXXVII. 2001) proposed '*Blastocladiomycota* nom. nov.' purposely to be an automatically typified name (Art. 16.1(a)) at the rank of phylum to replace the presumably descriptive (Art. 16.1(b)) 'infraphylum' name *Allomycotina* Caval.-Sm. (Biol. Rev. 73: 246. 1998), which lacked an included family with a validly published

*Printed with permission from Taxon, the International Journal of Taxonomy, Phylogeny and Evolution; editorially reviewed by Taxon Nomenclature Editor John McNeill.

**The proposals have not yet been assigned their official numbers by Taxon. The formal numbers will be accordingly updated in this section in Mycotaxon 111 (2010).

name based upon the presumed same generic stem name, *Allomyces* E.J. Butler. In the absence of an original Latin description or diagnosis, Doweld specifically cited the Latin description published by Cavalier-Smith for *Allomycotina* (l.c.), "*zoospora cilio unico instructa*" that minimally served to differentiate two "infraphyla" in Cavalier-Smith's classification. Through an oversight, the Latin phrase contradicts Doweld's own classification wherein other phyla within the kingdom as circumscribed by Doweld included taxa with uniflagellate zoospores. Therefore, citation of the previously published contradictory Latin phrase (Doweld l.c. 2001) failed to fulfil the requirements of Art. 32.2. The phylum name was later validly published as *Blastocladiomycota* T.Y. James (in Mycologia 98: 867. 2007 ['2006']).